Speech by A. I. MIKOYAN

Member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., and First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

at the

20TH CONGRESS of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

February 16
1956

Soviet News
Booklet No. 8

2D.

SPEECH BY A. I. MIKOYAN

Member of the presidium of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

16 February

COMRADES, I FULLY AGREE with the report of the central committee of the party and would like to discuss only some aspects of the committee's activities.

The central committee's report examines the new facts and events of mankind's history in the present period. Illuminating them with the light of Marxism-Leninism, the central committee draws a number of important, theoretically bold and deep-going fundamental conclusions connected with the laws of social development and their application in present-day conditions. Basic questions of Marxist theory have been raised as applied to the present situation. The conclusions drawn from them are not only of theoretical value; they acquire a *programmatic character* and great practical significance for the correct policy of communism in subsequent stages of development. This greatly enriches Marxism-Leninism and makes a valuable contribution to Marxist-Leninist science on the development of society.

The conclusions and theoretical propositions contained in Comrade Khrushchov's report show that our central committee, as is incumbent upon it as the body that is most well grounded, enriched with the experience of the Communist Party, does not simply reiterate the well-known theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism. Guided by the powerful Marxist method of knowing the laws of social development, the central committee provides an understanding of present-day social developments, explains them in a Marxist way and arms the working class with conclusions which now generalise and explain not only facts and events during the periods in which Marx and Lenin lived and worked but also subsequent developments both in the capitalist countries and in the socialist countries. I should like to discuss now some of these questions in view of their exceedingly great importance and urgency.

The main feature characterising the work of the central committee and its presidium in the past three years is that *after a long interruption collective leadership has been created* in our party.

Our party now has a firmly-knit leading collective, whose strength lies not only in that it consists of comrades who have worked together for many years in revolutionary struggle, which is of course very important, but chiefly in that this collective, guided by the Leninist ideas, the Leninist principles of party organisation and party leadership, has restored in a short time the Leninist standards of party life, from top to bottom.

The principle of collective leadership is elementary for a proletarian party, for a party of the Leninist type. But we have to stress this old truth because for some twenty years we actually had no collective leadership, and the cult of the individual, condemned first by Marx and then by Lenin,

prevailed. And this naturally could not fail to have an extremely adverse effect on the situation in the party and on its activities. And now that for the past three years collective leadership of the Communist Party has been restored on the basis of Leninist adherence to principle and Leninist unity, we feel the increasingly beneficial influence of the Leninist methods of leadership. That is the prime source which has imparted fresh strength to our party in recent years. That was the important prerequisite for the achievements mentioned in Comrade Khrushchov's report and is a pledge that our party will continue to advance still more confidently, still more successfully in building communism.

In recent years the central committee—and this was reflected in the report—has devoted much attention, among other urgent and pressing questions, to promoting the rapid growth of industry, and in the first place heavy industry, to launching the struggle for technical progress in industry, transport, agriculture and trade, for high labour productivity, for high quality of manufactured goods.

The main task has been to eliminate the lag in agriculture, to remove the resultant disproportion between the development of industry and agriculture—a disproportion which was most dangerous for our country and which in the future could be a very big hindrance to our progress. To accomplish this task a number of measures were taken, such as providing greater material incentives to the collective farmers and developing virgin and long-fallow land. Thirty-three million hectares[1] of new land have been cultivated in the past two years. Could we ever have dreamed of anything like that in the past?

And what is happening at the same time in American agriculture? The United States Government, in the President's message in January, submitted to Congress a programme for reducing the sown areas by 10 million hectares.[2] But that is outright destruction of the productive forces in agriculture—one of the latest very striking manifestations of the decay of capitalism. It turns out that in the United States, too, the problem of virgin and long-fallow land is raised, only it is raised in a topsy-turvy way, the American way. Instead of cultivating new lands they are turning ploughland into idle, virgin soil. And this is happening in a country which lays claim to "world leadership" and, moreover, at a time when, according to official statistics of the United Nations, an ever-increasing number of people in the capitalist world are undernourished and their number now reaches 59 per cent of the world's total population, whereas in 1939 it was 31 per cent. And at the same time in the United States it is planned to stop the cultivation of crops on 10 million hectares!

What is behind the claims to "world leadership" can be seen from the following example: last year American and British oil monopolies produced 150 million tons of oil in the Middle East at a cost of only $240 million, that is to say, at a fabulously low cost, making a net profit of $1,900 million; in one year all their capital investments in this oil-bearing area were repaid. In Kuwait, for example, they made in three months profits equalling the entire capital invested there. In the oil industry of the United States at least six to seven years would be required to get back the capital invested.

[1] About 81½ million acres. One hectare equals 2.47 acres.
[2] 25 million acres.

If all the income from oil were to go to its legitimate owners—the Arabs and other peoples of the Middle East — these people could very rapidly overcome their poverty and make up for everything lost in their economic and cultural development owing to ruthless exploitation by foreign capital for many years.

This notorious "world leadership" is also manifested in the invention of new, camouflaged forms of exploitation. Many peoples of Asia and Africa have freed themselves from colonial dependence, but the American and British monopolies, owing to their dominant position on the foreign markets, have imposed on the under-developed countries, as the peoples of those countries themselves declare, unjust prices, that is to say, a kind of "scissors" between the export and import prices. The result is that these peoples are now able to buy for the same quantity of their commodities (according to United Nations statistics) 40 per cent less of the goods they import than at the beginning of the present century. Here you have the so-called "care" and "aid" to under-developed countries!

Going back to the development of our agriculture, it should be said that here the situation is being remedied by the rational allocation of sown areas to the most important crops, comprehensive mechanisation of farming, reconstruction of the work of organising and guiding agriculture and changes in the planning of agriculture. Bureaucratic planning from the centre, which proved harmful to the work, has been abolished. The collective farms themselves now plan the sown areas and crop yields, and the number of livestock and their productivity, while the central bodies only fix the amounts of deliveries and the sales of agricultural produce to the state.

All these measures assure a rapid advance of agriculture and the elimination of the disproportion in our economy, and substantially strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

Productivity of agriculture has already been raised and as a result the production of foodstuffs and consumer goods for the population has noticeably expanded.

The task has been set of increasing the output of consumer goods by nearly 250 per cent by the end of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, as compared with the prewar year of 1940; the production of meat and fish is to grow by 220 per cent, tinned goods by 460 per cent, butter 290 per cent (that is to say, nearly fourfold), sugar 200 per cent, silk fabrics fourteen times over, woollen fabrics 200 per cent, sewing machines twenty-two times over, clocks and watches twelve times over etc.

Such a high rate of increase in the output of consumer goods now in short supply is to be explained by the fact that the central committee of our party is concerned over irregularities in supply in a number of places and the queues for some goods. It is asked at times: Are some irregularities in supply and queues for goods in short supply inevitable? Are they the concomitants of socialist trade? No, of course not. They arise when there is no proper balance between the available mass of goods and the effective demand of the population.

In socialist society demand should run ahead of the supply of goods. The ever-increasing demand drives forward the production of goods. The whole question lies in the degree to which demand runs ahead of supply. A serious gap between the available mass of goods and the monetary incomes of the

population brings about a disproportion in circulation and adversely affects Soviet trade, giving rise to queues and irregularities in the sale of some goods, creating inconveniences for the population, making for poor service in trade and hampering an improvement in the quality of goods.

We now have every possibility of eliminating such disproportion. Proper planning enables us to prevent such cases of disproportion in circulation in the future and to eliminate in the very first years of the new Five-Year Plan the queues and irregularities in supply which exist in some places. This should create the necessary amenities for customers, enhance the efficiency of trade, make for better service and ensure an improvement in the quality of the entire mass of goods, bringing them up to the level of the finest articles produced in our country and abroad, *and raise the whole of trade and public catering to a new, still higher level, conforming to the requirements of socialist society.*

Proper correlation between demand and supply will be reached through a sharp increase in the production of goods in short supply and the pursuance in the future of a policy of price reductions under which prices will be reduced only in proportion to the growth of the mass of goods and the increase in the effective demand of the population.

It must be frankly admitted that the organisation of the work in our shops and public catering establishments is inferior to that in the best among similar establishments abroad. This must be admitted in order to exert fresh efforts to bring up trade and public catering as quickly as possible to an adequate level. In so doing, it is necessary to extend the network of shops and dining rooms, of which we do not have enough, to re-equip them technically, to improve the organisation of the work, introducing self-service both in dining-rooms and in shops. We have to introduce in every way automatic machines, of which there are about 2 million in operation in America and only a few in our country. This will make it possible to provide amenities for customers, to reduce the expenses of circulation, and to raise the labour productivity of distributive workers.

In order to bring about a radical improvement in trade and public catering it is necessary to complete the decentralisation of management of trading establishments, to turn them over to local Soviets of Working People's Deputies, to draw the most active workers, office and other employees and housewives into exercising daily supervision and seeing to the improvement of trade and public catering. They, better than anyone else, should notice all the shortcomings in trade, exercise supervision, and see to the elimination of the shortcomings. Trade unions should play a decisive part in this supervision, while local Soviets should rectify all the shortcomings revealed.

Our central committee has also worked in the following important directions: implacable struggle against bureaucratic centralisation and the establishment of Leninist democratic centralism in its full scope; the safeguarding and consolidation of the union of Soviet nations, the sovereign rights of the Union Republics, the transfer to their jurisdiction of affairs that come within their competence but were formerly concentrated in the centre, which was wrong; in particular, a considerable number of industrial establishments have been transferred from the jurisdiction of central bodies to that of local bodies; extension of the rights of local Soviets and industrial

establishments; the drawing of the working masses into broad participation in compiling and examining economic plans, into more active participation in coping with tasks of production management; the pruning and simplification of the state apparatus, struggle against Communist vainglory and conceit, empty bragging, and boastful reports which have done us so much harm; promotion of criticism and self-criticism in its full scope, regardless of whom it may affect.

Among other important measures mention should be made of the division of Gosplan (State Planning Committee) into two commissions, for long-term and current planning, with the object of establishing a proper tie-up between the needs of the future and the needs of the present, with mutual control of these bodies designed to prevent disproportions in the economy.

Knowing how much Lenin was concerned over the planned nature of economic development, we may rest assured that this decision of the central committee on the reorganisation of Gosplan in the present conditions conforms to the requirements which Lenin presented to Gosplan in his day.

In the capitalist world, proportions in the economy are established spontaneously, through competition, the anarchy of production and crises. As distinct from this, in the socialist economy proportions are established by the will of organised society, by scientific planning based on the requirements of the objective laws of economic development. Hence, the planned nature of development and the prevention of serious disproportions in the economy depend on the proper, scientifically substantiated organisation of planning.

Comrade Khrushchov's report is not only a report on what has been done. A big and detailed programme for the accelerated advance to communism is presented for the examination of the congress in the report of the central committee and the draft directives on the Sixth Five-Year Plan. This programme indicates the ways for the development of industry and the entire national economy, and shows what has to be done to ensure a further substantial rise in the population's standard of living in conformity with the growing possibilities of the socialist system.

By setting the task of overtaking and surpassing the capitalist countries for *per capita* production, we are setting the task of overtaking and surpassing the richest capitalist countries for *per capita* consumption, of achieving full abundance of all consumer goods in our country.

On the order of the day there is also a range of highly important social measures, such as reduction of the working day, an increase in the wages of lower-paid categories of factory, office and other workers, helping them to educate their children and making easier the maintenance of aged parents through the establishment of state homes for the aged and the institution of appropriate pensions, free education, the development of a wide network of nurseries and kindergartens, the organisation of boarding schools for children, the provision of school meals and the development of a wide chain of public catering establishments. Lastly, this range also includes measures for expediting the solution of the housing problem and improving the public health services and education.

The increase in wages to lower-paid categories of factory, office and other workers will eliminate a certain disproportion in our economy, do away with the excessive gap between the wages of the lower-paid and higher-

paid categories. During the period when we were industrialising a peasant country such a gap was natural, because it stimulated the rapid growth of cadres of highly skilled workers who were badly needed by the country.

Now that we have a highly qualified, cultured working class which is being replenished every year by young people who have received a seven-year or ten-year education, the difference, although it should be preserved, will be narrowed down, which follows from the new level of our development and signifies a step forward to communism.

All these are the rudiments of communism. They open up the path to the communist way of life. This is a source of joy and inspiration to all of us. Let this also be known to the arrogant Americans who today plume themselves on their wealth, on their "American way of life". Let them enter into competition with us in this sphere and learn where more will be done for the good of the people, and whose way of life will prove to be better. Let them enter into such competition instead of engaging in the arms drive. We Soviet people, and the American people, too, find such competition more to our liking.

SOME QUESTIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Soviet foreign policy has scored notable successes, especially during the past year. In this sphere, too, the leading collective of the party has introduced a fresh stream, pursuing a foreign policy distinguished by lofty adherence to principle—an active and flexible policy, sustained in calm tones and devoid of abuse; it has proceeded from Lenin's inviolable behests on the peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, having as its main object to avert the war danger and ensure peace for the whole world.

To the surprise of many bourgeois leaders, our government has not been afraid to speak openly in the case of some international questions about instances where certain mistakes were made in our foreign policy in the past and where, in some cases, relations were worsened due also to our fault. The Soviet government has sought resolutely to eliminate shortcomings in our work in the sphere of foreign policy. This is seen in a most striking way in the settlement of the questions concerning relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. It goes without saying that only real Leninists are capable of taking the steps which the central committee took on the Yugoslav question in the period between the 19th and 20th Congresses. Now it is clear how correct these bold steps were, how beneficial they proved for the cause of peace and socialism.

A number of other measures, too—the dismantling of our military bases in China and Finland, the liquidation of mixed companies in the people's democracies, the Peace Treaty with Austria etc.—likewise show that our policy has been bold, based on principle, on respect for the sovereign rights of other peoples, and that it has been of an active character and for this reason has borne fruit.

As we are taught by Marxism-Leninism, our foreign policy is based on taking account of the concrete distinctive features of the situation, the actual relation of forces, on a proper assessment of the differences and shades in the policy of various countries in a particular period and above all on the question that is of paramount importance for us: the question of peace. In so doing,

we have cast aside some of the hidebound forms of work of our diplomacy, foreign trade and economic bodies in their relations with foreign states and citizens of those states; the isolation of Soviet public and state organisations from the outside world has been overcome and contacts between Soviet and foreign statesmen, party leaders and public organisations have been extended.

Certain American aggressive circles have played a definite part in rupturing contacts between countries. They have, however, tried to lay the blame at someone else's door, to shift it from themselves on to the Soviet people, by inventing the catchword about an "iron curtain", allegedly put up by the Soviet Union. This was presented as a sign of the "weakness of the Soviet regime", of our alleged fear of everything that might result from the contact of Soviet people with foreigners. They even went so such lengths as to claim that such contacts could undermine our state system.

We succeeded in swiftly exploding this myth and arranging broad contacts with other countries along governmental and public lines, in the spheres of art, tourist travel, sport and so on.

With some countries—democratic countries—these contacts are developing very well and have great prospects for further growth. In the case of some countries—the United States, for example—the going is hard and slow in view of the direct resistance offered by the State Department, in spite of the ardent desire of the American people and many public organisations in the United States.

The following amusing example can be cited. American restaurant specialists visited Moscow last year—they saw the sights of the city and went to all the establishments which were of interest to them, such as restaurants and dining-rooms. We did not even raise the question of our people visiting the United States on terms of reciprocity. What happened was simply that the American guests, being pleased with our hospitality, invited Moscow restaurant specialists to visit them and to study the work of American public catering establishments. And so contact was being established in this sphere. Not long ago five Moscow public catering workers were getting ready to go to America, but suddenly the State Department informed them that it regarded their visit to the United States as undesirable. Evidently our cooks and culinary experts represent a danger for some of the leaders of the State Department. This little instance makes it clear to all who is for contacts and who is against.

By our words and deeds we have exposed the lies about the aggressiveness of Soviet policy, spread by hostile circles abroad, and have proved that its peaceloving character is deeply rooted. We have blown to smithereens the silly fabrications about us being afraid of contact with foreigners.

It is ridiculous even to think that Communists may be afraid of contac with the capitalist countries. Who has a better social system—the Soviet Union or the capitalist countries? Whose ideas are loftier—ours, the Marxist-Leninist ideas, or the ideas of the capitalist world, which, it is true, had its great ideals in the epoch of the French Revolution, but which in its decline has no progressive ideas? The old ideals have become outmoded and as for new ideals which would have the progress of mankind as their goal, the capitalist system does not have them, nor could it have them, because it is a moribund system, it is already trailing in the wake of history.

When people in the West boast of their freedom and democracy they present a ridiculous spectacle. What comparison can there be between bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy, socialist democracy, democracy for the whole people which gives man full and genuine freedom, whereas bourgeois democracy, with its formal equality, sanctifies and protects the exploitation of man by man.

The central committee's report speaks rightly of Soviet socialist democracy as being incomparably higher than any bourgeois democracy.

Only the working class, the leading force of present-day society, only the Communist Party, the bearer of its ideology, have, or can have, progressive ideals. No ideas are more progressive than the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Gone is the time when the Soviet land of socialism was isolated, when we were an oasis in the capitalist encirclement. Today such a situation is out of the question. At the present time, together with a system of capitalist states, there is already a system of socialist states, bound by ties of everlasting friendship, community of historical destinies and a single desire to secure world peace. Today no basic international issue can be settled any longer solely by the will of the big western powers, without regard for the opinion of the Soviet Union, China and all the other socialist countries. The great strength of the socialist world lies not only in the fact that thirteen countries of Europe and Asia, with a population of nearly 1,000 million, are already building socialism; the strength of socialism also lies in the fact that in many countries where capitalism dominates the ideas of socialism have gripped the minds of the vast masses of the working population and, together with them, of the majority of mankind. Most of the world's population stand under the banner of socialism—they are either building socialism (and in the Soviet Union it has already been built) or are fighting for the right to build socialism.

While 100 years ago Marx and Engels said: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of communism", now it is no longer a spectre, but communism in flesh and blood, tangible and close to millions upon millions of working men, which is marching with a firm step, irresistibly, not only in Europe but throughout the world, and speaks with a loud voice, for all to hear. The influence of the ideas of communism on the whole of the contemporary life of human society has increased immeasurably.

From the standpoint of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism, against war, against the war danger, for peace among the peoples and for their freedom and independence, it may safely be said that the overwhelming majority of mankind are fighting together with us on this front. This is what determines the radical change in the correlation of the forces of peace and the forces of war, the correlation of the forces of socialism and capitalism throughout the world. Today it is no longer possible to say that capitalism is stronger than socialism merely because many rich, well-armed countries remain capitalist. *In the minds of mankind socialism is already today incomparably stronger than capitalism.*

Hence it is not we who have to be afraid of the struggle between the ideas of socialism and capitalism; that is why our party and its representatives Comrades Khrushchov and Bulganin, during their visit to India, Burma and Afghanistan in its name so boldly pilloried colonialism and openly declared

that we are against war, but for competition of the two social systems, for struggle of the two ideologies in conditions of peaceful co-existence.

In connection with the question of co-existence a few words should be said about international trade. The Americans are captives of the idea they themselves have invented, that by restrictions in trade with the socialist countries they will allegedly be able, at least to some extent, to retard the development of the Soviet Union, China and the other people's democracies.

Today, even in the West, very few people believe this; everyone sees that the socialist world economy is producing almost everything it needs, and as regards the main commodities production measures up to the present requirements of its countries. And so in the light of facts it turns out, for example, that the western countries, in tying themselves hand and foot by bans on trade with China, have barred themselves from such an important matter as the industrialisation of China, which could enable some of them to avoid curtailing production during the period of inevitable crisis.

It is our firm conviction that *lasting peaceful co-existence is inconceivable without trade*, which provides a good basis for it even after the formation of the two world markets. The existence of these markets—the socialist and capitalist markets—far from precluding, presupposes developed, mutually advantageous trade among all countries. A proper understanding of this question is of fundamental importance from the standpoint of the co-existence of the two worlds, and is also of practical, economic significance.

We proceed from the premise that our trade with the capitalist countries is mutually beneficial and that there are objective prerequisites for its further development. This is determined by the very necessity of the social division of labour, by the generally known fact that not all goods can be produced to the same advantage in all countries. In one country it is easier to produce some items, in another country, some other items; what tells here is the degree of development of different industries, the skills of the working class, production traditions etc. In this respect international trade has been, and remains to an even greater degree, an expression of the rational division of labour between the nations.

THE POSSIBILITY OF PEACEFUL SOCIALIST REVOLUTION IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

Comrades, the most acute and most important of the theoretical problems on which the central committee's report has dwelt is the question of whether it is absolutely necessary for the socialist revolution always, in all countries and under all conditions, to take place through an armed uprising, or whether peaceful revolution is also possible.

Is the view which is being circulated that a socialist revolution always involves a bloody civil war correct?

These questions are important if only for the reason that capitalist ideologists and propagandists represent the Communists as bloodthirsty creatures who strive for violence always and everywhere, whose aim is to unleash civil war at any cost. They claim that all these ideas are inherent in the dictatorship of the proletariat, are inevitable concomitants of the struggle for communism. Out of this they have tried, and are still trying, to build up a gruesome bogey to frighten the masses of the people who are spontaneously and consciously reaching out towards the ideas of socialism.

What are our views on these questions? Comrade Khrushchov's report gives a clear answer.

As you know, before the First World War the Bolsheviks regarded an armed uprising as the path to a victorious revolution in Russia. At the height of the First World War the Bolsheviks put forward the slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war. Our stand was correct and realistic, for the only way to stop the world slaughter and achieve peace and freedom for the peoples was by turning the imperialist war into a civil war.

As a result of the February Revolution the working people of Russia gained democratic freedoms that did not exist even in the United States, which was then regarded as the most democratic country. Lenin took the changed situation into account, and in his famous April Theses he put forward the slogan of seizure of power by the working class and accomplishment of the socialist revolution by peaceful means, through the winning of a majority in the Soviets.

Only after the events of July 1917, when the Provisional Government shot down a peaceful demonstration of workers in the streets of Petrograd, was the slogan of peaceful revolution withdrawn, for the situation had changed. The violence of the bourgeoisie plotting the Kornilov conspiracy had to be answered by violence, and power had to be taken through an uprising.

Actually, however, the October Revolution was accomplished almost peacefully, because by that time the majority in the Congress of Soviets as well as in many Soviets had become revolutionary. This enabled the Soviets to take power without much bloodshed.

Lenin, the Bolsheviks, did not urge civil war and violence after the October Revolution either. No, the party immediately outlined a path of peaceful development for Russia. Furthermore, Lenin urged that an agreement be made in the economic sphere with Russian and foreign capitalists who might want to work under the supervision of Soviet power. He proposed granting concessions to foreign capitalists and having enterprises of a state capitalist type.

How, then, did the civil war, which brought such suffering to our people, begin?

The whole world knows that the civil war was started by the imperialist powers, that this bloody civil war was brought about not by the revolution but by the counter-revolution, not at the will of the Bolsheviks but against our will.

What conclusions can be drawn from this? When, in which cases, was Lenin right?

When, before and during the First World War, he called for an armed uprising and demanded that the imperialist war be turned into a civil war? Or when, in the months immediately following the February Revolution, he put forward the slogan of a peaceful revolution? Or when, after the July events, he again put forward the slogan of an armed uprising?

When, in which cases, was he right? There can only be one answer: Lenin was right in all these cases.

In all these cases he did not guide himself by dogma, he did not cling to slogans which had lost their validity, but proceeded from the demands of life, which cannot be immutable. In formulating the slogans of the day

he took precise account of the real relation of the class forces and displayed a deep understanding of its trends of further development. That is the only way the Marxists should act, for otherwise slogans become dead dogmas which hinder the proletarian party in guiding the movement. Lenin was always concerned with this aspect, and he emphasised that "every slogan acquires the property of becoming more rigid than necessary" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 28, p. 203).

That is how the matter stood in our country. In principle, Marx, Engels and Lenin had the same approach to this question in the case of different countries: they always emphasised that everything depends on the period, the relation of class forces, the concrete situation.

In the seventies of the last century, Marx held that a preliminary condition for any real people's revolution in Europe was "to smash the bureaucratic-military state machine". He made an exception for Britain and overseas countries where the working class could at that time come to power by peaceful means, by gaining a parliamentary majority. At a meeting in Amsterdam in 1872, Marx said the following about the capture of power:

". . . We have never affirmed that absolutely the same means lead to this goal.

"We know that the institutions, customs, and traditions of the individual countries have to be taken into account; and we do not deny that there are countries like America and Britain—and, if I knew your institutions better, I might add Holland to them—in which the workers can achieve their goal by peaceful means.

"But if that is so we must also admit that in the majority of the Continental countries, force must serve as the lever of our revolution; force is what we shall have to resort to at a certain moment in order completely to establish the rule of labour" (Marx and Engels, *Works* (first Russian edition), Vol. 13, Part II, p. 669).

That was how Marx understood the paths of development of the revolution in different countries.

In 1917 Lenin wrote that in the new conditions of monopoly capitalism, owing to the growth of the police-bureaucratic machine in Britain and the United States, this reservation expressed by Marx had lost its validity; he sharply criticised Kautsky and the other renegades who tried to cling to the aforementioned statements of Marx, to raise the "peaceful path"—which, moreover, they interpreted in their own way, in a reformist way—into a principle for all countries and all periods of development, and to divert the proletariat from a revolutionary struggle for power.

The method of gaining power can thus not be the same for different countries, in different periods, in different international situations. Everything depends on the concrete relation of class forces, on the degree of organisation of the working class and its opponent, on the ability of the working class to attract allies to its side, above all, the peasantry; the institutions, customs and traditions in individual countries also have to be taken into account.

In this connection Lenin directed attention to the following:

"Marx did not commit himself—or the future leaders of the socialist revolution—to matters of form, to methods and ways of bringing about the revolution; for he understood perfectly well that a vast number of new

problems would arise, that the whole situation would change in the process of the revolution, that it would change often and considerably in the process of revolution" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 32, p. 316).

That is Lenin's understanding of, and Lenin's approach to, the tactics of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle.

Historical development was such, in the views of Marx and Lenin, that armed uprising would be the rule, the chief method, by which the proletariat came to power in the decisive majority of countries. As for the peaceful path, they regarded it as an exception advantageous to the working people, and they never ignored the possibility of the peaceful path. Lenin always emphasised that "the working class would prefer, of course, to take power into its hands *peacefully*" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 4, p. 254).

It is very important to note in this connection that Lenin maintained that even in the cases where the proletariat is compelled to resort to force, the chief and constant characteristic of the revolution and a condition of its victory is organisational, constructive work, and not destructive work.

In his speech honouring the memory of Y. M. Sverdlov, Lenin said:

"There is no doubt that without this feature—without the revolutionary use of force—the proletariat could not have won, but there is also no doubt that the revolutionary use of force was a necessary and legitimate method of the revolution only at definite moments in its development, only when definite and specific conditions existed, whereas a much deeper and constant characteristic of this revolution, and a condition of its victory, was, and remains, organisation of the proletarian masses, organisation of the working people. It is in this organisation of the working millions that lie the best conditions for revolution, the deepest source of its victories" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 29, p. 70).

Since Lenin's day the situation in the world has changed fundamentally. In view of this, our central committee is able, in the new conditions, guiding itself by the same Marxist and Leninist principles, to put the question of the forms of transition of various countries to socialism in a new light.

The chief factor of the radical changes in the international situation is the birth, growth and consolidation of the powerful camp of socialism. The Soviet Union has built a socialist society; great China and the people's democracies are moving rapidly along the path of building socialism. The socialist world system has established and consolidated itself and is developing, while the capitalist world system is in a state of crisis, has grown weaker, is losing one position after another.

The colonial system, which was an important reserve of capitalism, is disintegrating more and more. The peoples of India, Burma, Indonesia and Egypt have taken the path of free development; all the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are striving for freedom and complete independence. The level of organisation and class consciousness of the working class in the capitalist countries has grown.

Examining the question of the paths of revolution in the present-day period, we too must guide ourselves, as Marx and Lenin did in their time, by an exact account of the relations of the class forces in each individual country and on a world-wide scale. It is clear to all that in our day not a

single country can develop in isolation, without being influenced by other countries to a certain degree.

Lenin himself foresaw that the transition to socialism could take place peacefully in a small bourgeois country, given the existence of socialist countries as its neighbours. He implied that not only the relation of the class forces in one separate country but also the existence of victorious socialism in neighbouring countries should be taken into account.

It is in this connection that the central committee's report draws the conclusion that under the present conditions individual countries have the real possibility of going over to socialism peacefully. In other words, in individual countries by virtue of the relation of the class forces in those countries and thanks to the favourable general situation already described, the working class obtains the possibility, in alliance with the peasantry, of uniting the majority of the people under its leadership and coming to power peacefully, without an armed uprising, without civil war, employing the existing parliamentary institutions. A peaceful revolution is possible, of course, only if the working class is strong, well-organised, and class-conscious.

In other cases, when the bourgeoisie possesses a strong military and police machine, it will undoubtedly force an armed struggle on the proletariat in order to maintain its domination. The proletariat must be prepared for this beforehand.

That the central committee's presentation of the question is correct is shown by life's confirmation of the theoretical propositions of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. Since Lenin's day the socialist revolution has been victorious in more than ten countries. How has this taken place?

Let us take China. A civil war went on for decades in that great country. Over a long period the revolutionary armies fought bitter, bloody battles against the foreign imperialists and the counter-revolutionary forces of the landlords and the comprador bourgeoisie. The proletariat and its Communist Party, having taken a leading position and gained victory, by armed struggle, in the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution, ensured the possibility of going over to socialist transformations by peaceful means.

Leninism has gripped the minds and hearts of millions of the finest sons and daughters of China. Pointing out to the Chinese people the true road to socialism, *Leninism has flowered on Chinese soil as well, and has been enriched by the experience of the great Chinese revolution.*

So let us wish the Chinese Communists complete success in building socialism in that great country of the East.

In Yugoslavia the revolution took a specific course. When fascist Germany launched war against the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia rose to the leadership of the uprising against the fascist yoke; one section of Yugoslavia's bourgeoisie emigrated, keeping apart from the struggle against fascism, while the other section joined the fascists, becoming accomplices of the occupation regime. That is why the Yugoslav partisan war against fascism merged with the civil war against the bourgeoisie and landlords who had betrayed Yugoslavia.

The victory of the Yugoslav revolution is a source of our growing friendship and fraternal alliance with the Yugoslav Communist Party and the Yugoslav people, who are successfully building socialism.

In Czechoslovakia the revolution took a different course. Thanks to the

favourable situation which took shape in Czechoslovakia after the war, the socialist revolution was accomplished peacefully; the Communists came to power after having concluded an alliance not only with the working people's parties that stood close to them but also with the bourgeois parties which supported the common national front. The people of Czechoslovakia won victory in a peaceful revolution.

The working class in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland and other people's democracies achieved the victory of the socialist revolution each in its own way, but also without civil war.

The course of history has thus irrefutably demonstrated that the teachers of communism were right when they foresaw not only the path of armed uprising but also the path of peaceful revolution.

The fraternal Communist Parties in the capitalist countries have an inexhaustible treasury of knowledge: the theory of Marxism-Leninism, their rich school of practical experience, and the lessons of the historic victories recorded by our country, by China and by the other people's democracies.

There may be some would-be theoreticians, doctrinaires, or people not versed in politics who might ask: How does Marxism differ from reformism in this presentation of the problem, and isn't this a descent to the path chosen by the revisionists of Marxism?

The reformists and revisionists have always, now as in the past, worked only to restrict the struggle of the working class to minor reforms, to petty concessions by capital to labour; to bring about merely a slight improvement in the living conditions of the working class under capitalism, while preserving intact the domination of the capitalist system. They were and are, in essence, apologists of capitalism; they are not revolutionaries but evolutionaries who reject revolution and the seizure of power by the working people, and who believe that small and miserly "gains" over the course of many years can bring them some day to socialism. Perhaps some of them do not really believe this, but they are deceiving the people in that spirit.

There are cases of Socialist Parties having won a majority in parliament; Socialist governments have even existed, or exist today, in a number of countries. But in these cases, too, things have been limited to individual petty concessions in favour of the workers, and no socialism is being built. What is needed is that the working class should take over the government of society, that the working class should be prepared not only organisationally, but politically and theoretically as well, to fight for socialism, that it should not be content with crumbs from the capitalist table but, having obtained a majority, should take power into its hands and abolish private ownership of the basic means of production.

Historical materialism teaches that the replacement of capitalism by socialism, the replacement of class society by classless society, is a revolutionary leap. Essentially, this transition is the revolutionary replacement of one social system by another. Hence, every transition from capitalism to socialism, every fundamental change in social relations, is a revolution, in some cases more acute than in others, but a revolution which all peoples will accomplish. The capture of power by the people, the transition of the ownership of the means of production from a private to a social form, is the greatest revolution in history.

That is why the question of the possibility of peaceful revolution in

individual countries should not be confused with reformism. It should be remembered that *revolution—whether peaceful or not—will always be revolution*, while reformism will always remain a fruitless marking time. Hence, in order to win, the working class must wage a ceaseless struggle against reformism and the illusions which reformism engenders in its ranks.

IS WAR INEVITABLE?

THE QUESTIONS posed in the central committee's report with regard to the inevitability of wars and the durable and peaceful co-existence of the two systems are worthy of attention.

Leninism, as we know, takes as its starting point the fact that in the very essence of imperialism lies the source of conflicts and wars between countries, competing and struggling for markets, for a redivision of colonies. So long as imperialism is with us this tendency will prevail, and the danger of war will exist.

Is war possible in present conditions between imperialist countries or combinations of imperialist powers? Yes, it is.

Another question. Is there a danger of imperialist states attacking socialist countries? Undoubtedly there is. And this danger will continue until socialism gains overwhelming superiority over capitalism.

Then the question arises: Is another war inevitable, or in other words, is it possible to prevent war or not? The central committee's report gives a clear answer to this question:

> In the new conditions, too, the Leninist thesis holds good that so long as imperialism exists, the economic basis giving rise to wars also remains. But there is no fatal inevitability about war. This is determined by definite circumstances, characterised by the relation of forces in the world at the present stage of development. And such circumstances have appeared and taken root since the Second World War.

Against war and on the side of peace there now stand the Soviet Union, People's China and the other countries of people's democracy—they stand like a mountain wall. This is a tremendous force, one which cannot be ignored. Having won liberation from colonial oppression, peoples of Asia and Africa, a country like India, are against war and for peace. They have just freed themselves from foreign domination and, naturally, they fear that another war might bring back the colonial yoke. They want to develop freely, using their own forces; they do not want war; they need peace in order to ensure prosperity. In this respect, in the cause of peace, they are our allies.

In many European countries, in countries such as France and Italy, there is a developed working class enjoying enormous prestige among the people, which stands for peace and against war.

The workers in all countries, the peasants, working people, a considerable part of the intelligentsia, and part of the bourgeoisie do not want war—they are aware of the destructive force of war, having gone through the bitter experience of the last war. This is a big and very important factor.

But there are, say, big imperialist monopolies, such as those in the United States, which did not suffer from the war, but on the contrary, derived superprofits from it, and which are not at all against launching war, although the people of America are against war. In addition to being restrained by

public opinion, by the great military strength of the countries of socialism, these elements are deterred by one other important circumstance—namely, that atomic and hydrogen bombs are in the possession not only of the Americans but also of the Soviet Union, as well as the means of delivering these bombs to any point on the globe by plane and by rockets.

Never has a bomb or shell of another country fallen on American soil, on American towns and factories; this could not happen since the technique and the possibilities did not exist. Today, however, the possibilities are real enough. In the event of American aggression, hydrogen bombs, as a retaliatory measure, can be dropped on American cities, and the American imperialists will not be able to find shelter from these bombs, nor will they be able to protect their factories. This time, for certain, war would not be a source of enrichment for them; it would bring them nothing but devastation and annihilation.

We believe that if anyone attempts to use hydrogen or atomic bombs the best people of the world will not allow civilisation to perish; they will immediately unite, put the aggressors in straitjackets and end all wars, and, with them, capitalism.

Hydrogen and atomic war can cause fearful devastation, but it cannot wipe out humanity or its civilisation; it will destroy the outmoded and evil system of capitalism in its imperialist phase.

The decisive way to lasting peace lies through disarmament, the destruction of hydrogen and atomic bombs, and in peaceful co-existence, for which we are fighting and will continue to fight.

However, so long as the United States is against banning atomic and hydrogen weapons, so long as there is no disarmament, we are compelled to maintain our armed forces at the necessary level, including the most powerful modern weapons based on the latest achievements of science and technique.

The stronger the camp of socialism is, the greater are the chances that the world peace movement will win victory, and that the aggressors will not dare to unleash war.

That is why the report of the central committee declares that war is not inevitable. History has now entered a phase when although the danger of war remains and war might break out, conditions and possibilities have been created for preventing war *and for ensuring not only lasting peace but a stable peace*, provided the peoples wage a ceaseless struggle for peace, against the war danger and provided they are vigilant in relation to possible aggression.

When we speak of a long period of peace and a long period of co-existence some people ask the natural question: how long will this peace last and how long will this co-existence endure?

Our enemies interpret this as meaning that we, in the last analysis, are for war, that we want to spread communism throughout the world by means of war, that at the moment we are not yet ready for this and that we only want peaceful co-existence until such time as we are fully prepared and then we shall attack and impose communism by force of arms. Such is the "theoretical conception" which our enemies level against us. That, of course, slanders our policy. Communism does not need war, it is against war, and the idea of communism will triumph without war!

And the essence of our attitude to war lies not only in the humanism of the Soviet people, in their friendly feelings for all nations. The interests of successful communist construction, the struggle to raise the standard of living, are in direct contradiction with the policy of the arms drive and of expending human and material forces for war purposes.

The first decree of the newly-born Soviet power was the Decree on Peace. Lenin, as leader of the Soviet government, ceaselessly proposed peace and the establishment of diplomatic and trade relations with all countries.

Lenin said: "There is nothing more precious for us than peace. . . ." (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 32, p. 94). "The workers and peasants of Russia treasure the blessings of peace above all. . . ." (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 33, p. 125). "We stand for an alliance with all countries without exception" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 30, p. 341).

In February 1920, Lenin said: "Let the American capitalists leave us alone. We will leave them alone" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 30, p. 340).

Lenin's words and his behests about peace are sacred for us. We are ready to repeat them again and again, they are well known to our friends. Let them be heard, evaluated and correctly understood by our foes as well, by those who interfere with the desire of the peoples for warm friendship with the Soviet people.

Peace will enable us to build communism in our country and in the countries in which socialism has triumphed within a brief space of time. War can only retard our economic development, as was the case during the Patriotic War.

Sooner or later the ideas of communism will make their way to the hearts of all peoples and establish themselves throughout the world.

The correct Marxist-Leninist posing of the questions of war and peace in the report of the central committee will play a historic role in the future organisation of the world struggle of the forces of society against war, for peace, and will contribute in an ever-increasing measure to mankind's noble cause.

FOR IDEOLOGICAL WORK ON A NEW LEVEL

I WOULD LIKE to make a few remarks concerning the work of Communists in the sphere of ideology.

Objectively speaking, part of the blame for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in ideological work can be explained by the conditions created for scientific and ideological work over a number of years. But it is indisputable that a certain part of the blame for our serious lag on the ideological front rests with the workers on this particular front.

It is a matter for regret that during the past fifteen or twenty years we have given little, very little attention to the treasure-house of Leninist ideas for the purpose of understanding and explaining phenomena both in the internal life of our country and in the international situation. This took place, not of course because Lenin's ideas have become outmoded or are inadequate for an understanding of the present situation.

Leninism, the creative development of Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, retains, and will continue to retain, its theoretical and political force and practical significance.

Lenin's brilliant theses concerning the laws governing social development are an invaluable source for a correct understanding of many present-day phenomena. No, without Lenin these cannot be understood; without Lenin it is impossible to understand the present world situation, the laws underlying the decline of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism, the destiny of the proletarian revolution and its victory, the ways of building socialism and communism.

Relying on the eternally living teaching of Leninism, our party, its central committee, and the Communist and Workers' Parties abroad creatively apply this teaching in analysing the events and phenomena of the present period in the development of society and, by so doing, enrich Marxism-Leninism.

The report of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. gives a clear analysis of the present situation of capitalism. A certain growth of industrial output has taken place in the capitalist countries in the past period. But it has taken place in conditions of a further sharpening of the contradictions of capitalist production, of growing instability of its economy. Capitalist economy is in a state of over-strain; it is fraught with economic crisis. The further weakening of the capitalist system is taking place. There is also taking place the historical process of the contraction of the share of capitalism and the expansion of the share of socialism in world economy.

None of us can fail to be interested in the question of the present position of capitalism. Is it possible for capitalism in its period of decay and general crisis to develop at all? Is technical progress and the growth of production in capitalist countries possible today and tomorrow?

The theory of absolute stagnation of capitalism is alien to Marxism-Leninism. It would be wrong to say that the general crisis of capitalism means the end of rising output and technical progress in the capitalist countries.

In analysing the economic situation of present-day capitalism it is doubtful whether we get any help from Stalin's thesis in the *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* or whether it is correct—in relation to the United States, Britain and France—that, with the break-up of the world market the "volume of production in these countries will shrink". This assertion does not explain the complex and contradictory phenomena of present-day capitalism and the fact of the growth of capitalist production in many countries since the war.

As has been stated in the report of the central committee, Lenin in 1916 in his work on imperialism, having brilliantly illuminated the laws of imperialism, pointed out that the decline of capitalism does not preclude a rapid growth of production, that in the epoch of imperialism individual branches of industry and individual countries display, to a greater or lesser degree, now one and now another of these tendencies.

All the facts show that these Leninist theses are in no way outdated.

Incidentally, one cannot but note that other theses of the *Economic Problems* as well, if strictly examined, demand from our economists profound study and critical re-examination from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism.

The course of history shows that invariably all the fundamental propositions of Marxism-Leninism find confirmation in the present phase of imperialist development as well. But general confirmation is not enough.

We are obliged to study concretely when, where, to what degree, and how this takes place.

We are lagging seriously in our study of the present phase of capitalism, do not make a profound study of facts and figures, and frequently, for purposes of agitation, confine ourselves to individual facts relating to the impending crisis, to the impoverishment of the working people, but we fail to give an all-round and profound evaluation of the phenomena observed in the life of foreign countries. Our economists, in studying the economy of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, frequently skim the surface, do not get to the heart of the matter, fail to make a serious analysis and generalisation, and avoid shedding light on the peculiarities of development in the individual countries.

And in fact who can engage in a serious study of these questions? Before the war we had the Institute of World Economy and World Politics, but it was closed, and the single Economic Institute attached to the Academy of Sciences fails, and cannot but fail, to undertake a profound study of the economy in the socialist countries and in the capitalist countries. In the system of the Academy of Sciences there is an institute for studying questions relating to the East, but one can say of it that whereas the whole of the East has awakened, this institute is still slumbering.

Is it not time that it rose to the level of the tasks of the day?

It is difficult to understand why the Oriental Institute, which existed in Moscow for 139 years, was closed, especially in a period when our contacts with the East are growing and becoming stronger, and when, as a consequence of the extension of our economic, political and cultural ties with the countries of the East, the interest displayed in them by Soviet people has grown immeasurably, and in a like manner the demands for people who know the languages, economy and culture of these countries.

One cannot but pay attention to the fact that, as they say, in the United States about a score of scientific establishments are studying the Soviet economy. I say nothing as to how this study is carried out, but the fact is that they have there a large number of economists engaged in selecting material and studying economic developments in the Soviet Union.

Note should be taken of the big success of the group of economists who issued the textbook on political economy and who afterwards supplemented and reprinted this textbook. But it would be wrong to keep silent about the fact that the part dealing with modern capitalist development—particularly the character and the periodicity of the cyclical crises—and also questions relating to the political economy of socialism, require further profound study and elaboration.

Recall the mountains of statistical material which Marx gathered on the economy of all countries, including Russia, in order to draw his brilliant conclusions. Remember the enormous labours carried out by Lenin in searching for the then rare but extremely valuable statistical data on economic development in order to write his book about the development of capitalism in Russia, and also in preparing his work on imperialism.

Without a most careful examination of all the statistical data, which we possess in far larger measure than at any other time and than in any other country, without systematising these data, without analysing and drawing general conclusions from them, no scientific economic work is possible.

It is a matter for regret that statistical data are still on the secret list in the Central Statistical Administration in Comrade Starovsky's safes. The economists are deprived of the possibility of examining them and are doomed to the role of talmudists, repeating old formulas and old data. This is one of the reasons why we do not see any creative work by our economists.

One should not forget the remark made by Lenin concerning the importance of statistics. In 1918 Lenin wrote: "In capitalist society statistics were a subject exclusively for 'civil servants', or for narrow specialists—we must bring them to the masses, popularise them. . . ."

The impression is created, I regret to say, that even now Lenin's remark about "civil servants" is justified in relation to our statisticians who still cling to some of the hangovers of the old society.

The central committee's report speaks of the unsatisfactory nature of our *propaganda* work. One of the reasons for this is that, as a rule, we teach Marxism-Leninism on the basis of the *Short History of the Party*. That of course is incorrect. The wealth of ideas of Marxism-Leninism cannot be contained within the limits of the subject of the history of our party, all the more so since it is a brief history. For this we need special theoretical textbooks for comrades at different educational levels. That is the first thing. Secondly, the present *Short History of the Party* is unsatisfactory because it does not deal with the events of nearly twenty years of our party. And how can we justify the absence of a history of our party for the past twenty years?

Further. If our *historians* would make a real and profound study of the facts and events in the history of our party during the Soviet period, including those treated in the *Short Course*, if they made thorough use of the archives and historical documents, and not only newspaper files, then they would now be in a better position, from the standpoint of Leninism, to shed light on many of the facts and events set out in the *Short Course*.

Another question. Is it normal that nearly forty years after the October Revolution, we have neither a brief nor complete Marxist-Leninist textbook on the history of the October Revolution and the Soviet State, in which, without any colouring, there would be shown not only the facade but the life of the Soviet homeland in all its multiformity? Imagine the tremendous theoretical and political importance of a textbook that would shed full light on the rise and development of the first socialist state in the world. How important it would be for our cadres, and also for progressive people throughout the world!

Scientific work in the sphere of the history of the party and of Soviet society is, perhaps, the most backward sector of our ideological work.

Indeed, until quite recently we circulated and even held up as indisputable models books on the history of such big party organisations as the Transcaucasian and Baku organisations, in which the facts were juggled, some people being arbitrarily glorified, while others were not mentioned at all; secondary events were given undue prominence, while other and more important events were minimised, where the leading and directing role of the pre-revolutionary Leninist central committee of the Bolshevik Party was belittled.

We are still without a real Marxist work covering the period of the Civil War. A number of books that have been published suffer from major short-

comings, are of no scientific value, and some are even harmful.

Some of the complicated and contradictory events of the Civil War of 1918-20 are explained by certain historians not by the changes that took place in the relationship of class forces at definite periods but by the alleged subversive activity of individual party leaders at the time, who many years after these events were incorrectly proclaimed enemies of the people.

One Moscow historian even went so far as to allege that if Comrade Antonov-Ovseyenko or Comrade Kossier had not been among the Ukrainian party leaders, it is quite possible that there would have been no Makhnos and no Grigorievs, that Petlura would not have had success at definite periods, and there would not have been the penchant for implanting Communes (a phenomenon, incidentally, which was not confined to the Ukraine, but common to the whole party at the time), and the line taken by the entire party and country as a result of N.E.P. would have been adopted immediately in the Ukraine.

Such historical scribbling has nothing whatever in common with Marxist history. It is much more of an idealist, social-revolutionary interpretation of historic events. I think that historians can be found in the Ukraine who will write about the rise and development of the Ukrainian socialist state better than some of the Moscow historians who undertook this work and who would have done much better had they not touched it at all.

It is necessary to say at least a word or two about our *philosophers*. Yes, they themselves must understand that they are not in any better position, and that some of them are even more in debt to the party than the historians and the economists.

I want to dwell for a moment on our *jurists*. It should be noted that Soviet juridical science, law and the code of procedure in the first period of Soviet power, while Lenin was still alive and for a few years after his death, developed rapidly in harmony with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism based on proletarian socialist law and were correctly reflected in the programme of our party.

The same cannot be said about the subsequent period, a matter which aroused understandable alarm in the central committee of the C.P.S.U., which considered it desirable to intervene in this matter in order to remedy the situation from the standpoint of fully affirming Leninist socialist law, as has been stated in the central committee's report.

Economically and politically our country has risen to tremendous heights. We are examining the programme of a new and still greater economic advance.

In our party we have an enormous number of theoretically trained cadres of economists, historians, philosophers, jurists, people who know the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism by rote. However, the efficiency of these cadres is exceedingly low, and we feel the lack of profound Marxist-Leninist creative work.

Most of our theoreticians are engaged in repeating and turning upside down old quotations, formulas and propositions.

What science can there be without creation? It can only be scholastic, textbook exercises, and not science, since science is, above all, creation, that is to say, creating something new, and not constant repetition. It would be much better for our scientific workers to devote themselves to studying new facts in our life, new events and phenomena in the sphere of economic

and social developments in the U.S.S.R. and abroad, to an all-round study of these facts and phenomena, to examine them in the light of Marxism-Leninism and, in this way, to enrich the treasure-house of Marxism-Leninism.

It is to be hoped that the 20th Congress of the party will give a serious impulse to workers on the ideological front, that they will really get down to creative scientific activity. There is much work to be done here—work needed by the people—difficult, interesting and honourable work.

And let the workers on the ideological front know that the party will no longer tolerate any further lagging behind life. Economists, historians, philosophers and jurists must march in step with the party, with our life, must overcome the lag in scientific work and ensure the creative enrichment of Marxism-Leninism.

* * *

Comrades! The report testifies to the tremendous work done by the central committee, by the entire Communist Party and by all our Soviet people during the period between the 19th and 20th Congresses, and testifies fully that we are on the right road in the great cause of communist construction.

Relying on collective leadership and the unity of the Communist Party, the central committee has boldly disclosed the mistakes and shortcomings of recent years and has resolutely taken the path of correcting them and eliminating them from all sectors of political activity and economic, cultural and inner-party building. Therein lies the true Leninist feature of the work of our central committee. It will not be an exaggeration to say that this is the most important congress in the history of our party since the death of Lenin. *Lenin's spirit and Leninism permeate all our work and all our decisions*, just as if Lenin were alive and with us.

You know what alarm Lenin felt, before departing from us, for the destiny of our party and the revolution. He feared above all division in the party and division in the alliance between the working class and the peasantry. He was concerned to find ways and means of preventing both the one and the other. He was convinced that given unity in the party ranks, in its leadership, by preserving and strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, the cause of communism would be invincible.

How glad Lenin would be, if now, after thirty-two years, he could see the organisational and political unity which exists today in the ranks of our party and its leadership, how the ideas of Marxism-Leninism are blossoming, how strong and unbreakable is the alliance between the working class and the collective-farm peasantry, if he could see that we not only vow by the name of Lenin but that we are doing everything to translate Lenin's ideas into life, sacredly carrying out his behests.

The 20th Congress of our party, its decisions, and the report of the central committee will find a wide and warm response in the party, in the Soviet Union and among our friends abroad. The new and magnificent task confronting our party and the country will be fulfilled. Of that we have not the slightest doubt. Of this our friends, too, are convinced, and let our adversaries likewise have no doubt about it. The guarantee of our advance to communism is above all that, as was said by Lenin, our immortal leader and teacher: "We rely on the most wonderful force in the world—on the force of the workers and peasants."

Published by Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Beechwood Rise, Watford, Herts.